1		0
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	LAWRENCE EDWARD SALONE, JR.,	) CASE NO. CV 09-08460 AG (RZ)
12	Petitioner,	) ) ) ODDED ACCEPTING EINDINGS
13	vs.	ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND
14	BUREAU OF PRISONS,	) RECOMMENDATIONS OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
15	Respondent.	{
16		<i>)</i>
17	Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court has reviewed the Petition, records on	
18	file, and the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge, and has	
19	considered de novo the portions of the Report as to which Petitioner has filed objections.	
20	Essentially, Petitioner objects that the recommended mootness-based dismissal is	
21	unwarranted because, although he received the expungement and sentencing credit he had	
22	demanded, he did not also receive restitution.	
23	For the following three reasons, the objections do not persuade the Court.	
24	First, Petitioner did not pray for restitution in his petition. He sought only expungement	
25	and sentencing credit. (As interim relief, he also sought appointment of counsel.) His	
26	final boilerplate reference to "such other and further relief as" is appropriate cannot fairly	
27	be understood as a prayer for restitution or damages.	
28		

Second, whether prayed for or not, damages ordinarily are not available in a habeas proceeding. Generally, habeas petitions properly may challenge only the fact or duration of confinement. *See generally Preiser v. Rodriguez*, 411 U.S. 475, 484, 93 S. Ct. 1827, 36 L. Ed. 2d 439 (1973).

Third, Petitioner's objections do not excuse or alter the fact that, as recited in the Report, Petitioner failed to respond to the Magistrate Judge's show-cause order — an order whose sole purpose was to give Petitioner a chance to explain why the action might not be moot. His silence permitted the Court to deem him to have consented to dismissal. It was for that reason, in addition to Respondent's submissions, that the Magistrate Judge prepared the Report in the first place.

With the foregoing observations, the Court accepts the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge.

DATED: MAY 18, 2010

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE